



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to the good sense of the French statesmen, that peril too passed away, and we have another *entente cordiale* established.

"This rapid survey perhaps leads you sorrowfully to think that an *entente cordiale* need not be abiding because it seems strong and for the moment full, but it must lead you also to reflect that, in spite of the incitements of those who know, in spite of the prophecies of those who have been falsified by facts again and again, in spite of all the attempts to incite people on both sides of the Channel, there is a growing good sense, that knowledge of one another which comes of intimate intercourse, of interchange of visits, of interchange of conceptions. There is that intercourse arisen which, I hope, will forever prevent such a calamity as a collision between the two leaders of civilization in the West.

"I am bringing these records of the past to falsify the prophecies of the prophets of the past. Do the prophets of to-day think they are wiser than those who went before? Do they think they have larger knowledge? Do they think they are more fully authorized? At best they must say: 'It is true our predecessors were mistaken, but we have better means of ascertaining the truth.' I demur to their judgment. I insist that the nation should judge independently of prophets who belong to a school so often falsified, and to have recourse to faith in the goodwill of nations rather than the machinations of a few politicians. Not that I want to flatter the population, not that I want to say peoples cannot go mad. What I say is, guard against lunacy. Take care that you are saved from it; give a good account of yourselves and of your conduct to your neighbors. Keep your heads cool, your judgment clear, and the future shall repeat the past, and we shall escape from perils which are 'inevitable,' but which do not come off.

"There is one other very short retrospect to which I might invite your attention. There is another country as to which we have had excitements and alarms for a century past, alarms which have never been realized. I am speaking—you will scarcely dream it—of the United States of America. Ever since the close of the War of 1812 we have had peace with the United States. We have had something more which I wish you to realize. We have had a treaty of disarmament with the United States. Ever since 1814 we have been under terms of agreement with the United States never to put any armaments on the great inland waters. You know how easy it would be, taking Lake Superior, Lake Erie, and the rest of them, to arm both channels of those lakes and have flotillas on those waters, which are wider than the Straits of Dover, which are wider even than the passage between London and Bremen. But these great waters have been free from armaments, free from hostile fleets, in compliance with the agreement of 1814.

"If it is possible to have that agreement, which was conceived, which was expressed, which was executed nearly a century ago, which has been literally and faithfully observed in spirit from that day to this, is it impossible that we can have a similar agreement with other nations of the world? We have had perils and threats with France. They have come; they have gone. We are now on terms of the greatest friendship with that great republic. Long may we remain so! Long may that treaty serve as a starting-point in history to be taken

up after many years, to be followed by others, and to show by its influence and the examples I have quoted to you how futile, how foolish, how misleading are these mocking messengers who come to tell us of the inevitableness of war. War is not inevitable. It depends on us and our fellows whether it shall come or not. Be determined that it shall not come, and we may trust in the highest Power that the future will justify our faith."

The Peoples and Peace.

Letter of the Bishop of Hereford to the Christian Conference on Peace held in Caxton Hall, London, July 27.

All who desire the maintenance of unbroken international peace will feel grateful to His Majesty King Edward for the gracious reception he offers to the members of this International Congress, as well as for his unceasing efforts and influence in the cause of peace and good-will. Our thanks are also due to His Majesty's government for the special welcome they give to this gathering of representative delegates from so many nations. Those of us who attended the Boston Congress in 1904 and listened to Mr. John Hay's address, delivered on behalf of the President of the United States and on his own behalf, felt that a great accession of strength and influence had been given to the cause of international arbitration and peace by his presence and support; and we have every reason to anticipate a similar good result from the reception accorded to the Congress here in England to-day.

This recognition from within the sphere of practical politics is all the more welcome because no one looking over the civilized world can fail to see how greatly the cause of peace needs all possible support from every quarter. So long as the most powerful nations and empires persist, as they do to-day, in the mutually provocative race of ever-increasing armaments, and are stimulated by diplomatists and statesmen and by an irresponsible and sometimes unscrupulous press thus to persist in it, peace must inevitably remain in a state of unstable equilibrium, exposed to sudden alarms and indefinite risks. Such a competition, with the spirit that engenders it and is propagated afresh by it, constitutes an ever-present danger, and is in fact an insidious foe of that *entente cordiale* which all good men desire to see universally established among the great powers.

Of its dangerous influence we had striking evidence in England within the last few days, when in our House of Lords a man of great diplomatic experience uttered a grave foreboding as to the risk of our being involved in a European war before many years have elapsed. Most of us hope and believe that such a forecast is unduly pessimistic; it is the forecast of one who has lived mainly in the atmosphere of diplomacy. We think it overlooks the growing power of the democracy even in autocratic empires, and the growth of international good-will among the working multitudes and their leaders. But such a declaration from such a quarter brings home to the people at large certain valuable reminders. It should make it clear to them that the European situation is and will continue to be full of peril, if the issues of peace and war are left to be decided in the artificial atmosphere of secret diplomacy, behind the back and without the knowledge of parliaments and the people they severally represent.

This being so, it amounts to a direct call to the mass of the people and their leaders in the countries concerned, being, as they now are, friendly to each other, to take steps betimes, so that no such wickedness as a preventable war may be secretly engineered. Such a warning, whether we count it wise and prudent or the reverse, is in fact a startling summons to the mass of the people to remember that the drift of foreign affairs and the foreign policy of their government are their immediate concern and cannot safely be left to the secret management of any class. In other words, the people themselves in every country must seek peace and ensue it.

In the face of such storm signals it is a plain patriotic duty to remove all causes of quarrel over national interests, and very sternly to suppress all incentives to any outburst of race passion which might sweep us headlong into the arbitrament of brute force. Every true patriot will do his utmost in his own country so to influence both rulers and people that the bloodshed, the waste, the miseries and horrors—in one word, the barbarism—of a European war may be averted. The very thought of the miseries it would bring in its train should help to make it impossible. But our best hope of ensuring an undisturbed international peace rests on the growing power in all countries of an educated democracy under educated leaders, who have learned the good lesson that war is a method of barbarism and a hateful thing, that it always brings sorrow and suffering, and seldom benefit, to the people unless it is fought to win or maintain their freedom, and that the reign of law should be as paramount in national and international affairs as in those of individual men.

Now all men are agreed that in civilized society individuals cannot be permitted to fight out their differences by private personal conflict. This would be a barbarous proceeding we say, and altogether out of date. Well, then, is it not high time for those governments, nations and empires which count themselves the leaders of civilization, to relegate this gospel of brute force to the limbo of things discarded as barbarous? Ought not the distinction between conduct which is civilized and conduct which is barbarous to be the same for nations as for individuals? Is it unreasonable to demand of all rulers and all governments claiming to be civilized this extension from individuals to nations of the reign of peace based upon the reign of law? Here in Europe it would simply mean that the great powers, which, as we cannot forget, call themselves Christian powers, should agree to recognize a common tribunal of arbitration as paramount to settle their own differences, as well as those of smaller nations. It would mean the ultimate appeal, in cases of difference, to a court of international law and equity, instead of the appeal to brute force. It would mean the spread of a spirit of good-will among the nations, instead of the spirit of rivalry, suspicion and antagonism. It would mean in every country the gradual lifting from the shoulders of the masses of the oppressive burden of bloated armaments, thus setting free a vast amount of national resources to be used for the prosperity and the happiness of the people at large.

Surely, then, on behalf of the multitudes, we may fairly demand of the great powers of Europe—for it is to these in particular we have to address our appeal—that, inasmuch as they claim to be civilized powers, to say

nothing of their claim to be Christian, they should enter into a genuine and *bona fide* concert to accept a common tribunal as the arbiter of any differences that may arise between one and another of them, and should freely recognize that the cynical, old-world, barbaric rule that the strongest bully shall prevail—*ut in grege taurus*—is a rule to be repudiated by every civilized nation or power.

The risks and obstacles in the way are still undoubtedly very formidable. There are the tone of opinion and the temper fostered by the great military autocracies. There is the dangerous growth of militarist sentiment among rival commercial communities. There is the mischievous influence of some portions of an anonymous press in every country, calling for increasing watchfulness, and deserving the execration of every true patriot; and there is the liability of democracies to be misled by this malignant influence, and to be swept away on the waves of passion, or panic or prejudice.

It is easy enough, and not without its uses, to point in calm weather to these rocks ahead. Great will be the service to humanity of those who render them innocuous. For this inestimable service we appeal to our rulers, our governments, our parliaments, our public press, our democratic leaders, our churches, Catholic and Protestant, and our schools for the young, in every country; and we look not least to the members of such a Congress as this so to educate public opinion and the public conscience in there respective countries, so to influence the spirit and policy of their governments, that the peace of the nations and the prosperity and happiness of those multitudes in every land who are the greatest sufferers from war may no longer be exposed to these dangerous rocks ahead.

Statesmanship vs. Battleship.

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

Address at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, May 20, 1908.

There is never a time when any cause is in so hopeful a condition as when it is between great triumphs and great tasks; when it is encouraged and fortified by the thought of victories behind it, and commanded by the thought of large duties before it. That is precisely where we stand. The advance of the cause in whose interests we are here has been, in the ten or dozen years since we first began to assemble here, something which the most optimistic of us in that first time could hardly have believed possible. We have been dreaming for so many decades about the Parliament of Man, the poets have been singing about it so long, that it is hard to realize that at last it is here in plain prose and that some of us outsiders were privileged to sit in the gallery there at The Hague for a little, last autumn, in the old Hall of Knights, and look down upon the Parliament of Man in actual operation. It is a wonderful international epoch in which we stand. If we had been told here at Mohonk ten years ago, in the days when Dr. Hale used to be making his resolute prophecies, that we should see to-day an international tribunal in the world, that we should see an international parliament practically assured, that we should see an international prize court, that we should see fifty-six treaties of arbitration already concluded between nations,—I say the most hopeful of us could hardly have believed that thing. Yet that is what has been realized up to the present year of grace.